



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,069	09/25/2001	Akira Murotani	16869S-032010US	2038

20350 7590 07/19/2005

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
EIGHTH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

AILES, BENJAMIN A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/964,069

Applicant(s)

MUROTANI ET AL.

Examiner

Benjamin A. Ailes

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-19, 21 and 23-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-19, 21 and 23-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to Amendment filed 03 May 2005.
2. Claims 1-16, 20, and 22 have been canceled.
3. Claims 17-19, 21, 23-29 are pending.

### ***Double Patenting***

4. Due to the cancellation of claims by the applicant, the prior double patenting rejection has been withdrawn.

### ***Claim Objections***

5. Due to the cancellation of claims 13 and 15 by the applicant, the prior objections to claims 13 and 15 have been withdrawn.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 2142

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 17, 18, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanada et al. (E.P. 0 881 560 A2), hereinafter referred to as Sanada, in view of Suzuki (U.S. 5,796,736).

9. Regarding claims 17 and 25, Sanada discloses a storage controller comprising:  
a control portion connected to fabric connected to a fiber channel port contained in an upper node device, wherein the control portion passes a packet via the fabric with the upper node device (Fig. 1 and col. 5, lines 35-41); and

a control table containing a node name of the upper node device, a port name of the fiber channel port, and a fiber channel port access enabled/disabled state (Fig. 6 and col. 10, lines 25-40). Sanada discloses the use of a control table to store identification information and the ability to update and maintain a control table (col. 10, lines 25-30 and col. 12, lines 32-38) but does not explicitly state the replacement of identification information for when the connection port is replaced. However, Suzuki discloses a network auto-discovery method wherein the network nodes are automatically recognized and connection information is automatically accessed (col. 3, lines 46-61). One of ordinary skill in art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to combine the control table provided by Sanada et al. with the automatic discovery method of network nodes taught by Suzuki in order to keep track of all nodes in the network (Suzuki, col. 4, lines 43-48).

Art Unit: 2142

10. Regarding claims 18 and 26, Sanada discloses the storage controller wherein the storage controller detects a node name of the upper node device whose connection state to the fiber channel port is changed, detects a port name of a fiber channel port to be connected to the upper node device of that node name, compares the detected port name with the port name contained in the control table (see Abstract and col. 2, lines 38-47, and col. 3, lines 21-32), and if a first port name is not detected but stored and a second port name is detected but not stored, then detects that the fiber channel port of the first port name is replaced by the fiber channel port of the second port name.

Sanada et al. disclose the use of a control table to store identification information but are silent on the replacement of identification information for when the connection port is replaced. However, Suzuki disclose a network auto-discovery method wherein the network nodes are automatically recognized and connection information is automatically accessed (col. 3, lines 46-61). One of ordinary skill in art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to combine the control table provided by Sanada et al. with the automatic discovery method of network nodes taught by Suzuki in order to keep track of all nodes in the network (Suzuki, col. 4, lines 43-48).

11. Claims 19, 21, 23, 24, 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanada.

12. Regarding claims 19 and 27, Sanada discloses the computer system wherein the control table is provided for each of the upper node devices (Fig. 6 and col. 2, line 48 – col. 3, line 4).

Art Unit: 2142

13. Regarding claims 21 and 28, Sanada discloses the storage controller wherein when a port name of a fiber channel port allowing access is entered, a node name of the upper node device to which the fiber channel port allowing access is to be connected is detected, a port name of the fiber channel port to be connected to the upper node device of that node name is detected, and the control table is created containing the node name, the port name, and the entered access enabled/disabled information (col. 2, lines 17-58).

14. Regarding claims 23 and 29, Sanada discloses the storage controller wherein the interface between the upper node device and the storage controller is a fiber channel standardized by ANSI X3T11 (col. 2, lines 17-23).

15. Regarding claim 24, Sanada discloses the storage controller wherein the a storage device having a plurality of storage domains is connected to the storage controller and the access enabled/disabled management is performed for each of the storage domains and each of the fiber channel ports (Fig. 1 and col. 10, lines 13-40).

### ***Response to Arguments***

16. Applicant's arguments filed 03 May 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

17. (A) Applicant argues: "...there is no disclosure concerning the art of updating a control table, when the connection status of the input/output port was changed."

18. As to point (A), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sanada discloses the ability to update and maintain a control table in column 12, lines 27-38. Sanada discloses a

control table wherein information is stored and a user may update information. The information is maintained and stored in the control table using computers.

19. (B) Applicant argues: "...there is no disclosure concerning the art of updating a control table, when the connection status of the input/output port was changed."

20. As to point (B), applicant is referred to the explanation of point (A) and the above prior art rejections.

21. (C) Applicant argues: "there is no disclosure that a control table includes identification information of upper node device, identification information of input/output port of the upper node device and information concerning access enabled or access disabled."

22. As to point (C), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Sanada discloses in figure 8 the use of a control table organized to record identification information of the upper node device, identification information of the input/output port and in figure 9 the steps taken to determine information used to determine accessibility.

### ***Conclusion***

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

24. Blumenau et al. (U.S. 6,845,395) disclose a method and apparatus for identifying network devices on a storage network.

25. Hubis (U.S. 2005/0050191) discloses storage network and method for storage network device mapping.

26. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin A. Ailes whose telephone number is (571)272-3899. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5, First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 2142

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BAA

*Beatriz Prieto*  
**BEATRIZ PRIETO**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**